

health and increases their risk for breast cancer.

5. Albrektsen G, Heuch I, Tretli S, Kvale G. Is the risk of cancer of the corpus uteri reduced by a recent pregnancy? A prospective study of 765,756 Norwegian women. *International Journal of Cancer* 1995 May 16;61(4):485-90, p. 485.

6. La Vecchia C, Negri E, Franceschi S, Parazzini F. Long-term impact of reproductive factors on cancer risk. *International Journal of Cancer* 1993 January 21;53(2):215-9, p. 217.

Albrektsen G, Heuch I, Tretli S, Kvale G. Is the risk of cancer of the corpus uteri reduced by a recent pregnancy? A prospective study of 765,756 Norwegian women. *International Journal of Cancer* 1995 May 16;61(4):485-90, p. 485.

Kvale G, Heuch I. Is the incidence of colorectal cancer related to reproduction? A prospective study of 63,000 women. *International Journal of Cancer* 1991 February 1;47(3):390-5, p. 392.

7. Frank P, McNamee R, Hannaford PC, Kay Cr, Hirsch S. The effect of induced abortion on subsequent fertility. *British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 1993 June;100(6):575-80.

Heisterberg L, Kringelbach M. Early complications after induced first-trimester abortion. *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica* 1987;66(3):201-4, p. 204.

8. Barrett JM, Boehm FH, Killam AP. Induced abortion: a risk factor for placenta previa. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 1981 December 1;141(7):769-72.

Rose GL, Chapman MG. Aetiological factors in placenta praevia—a case controlled study. *British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 1986 June;93(6):586-8.

Taylor VM, Kramer MD, Vaughan TL, Peacock S. Placenta previa in relation to induced and spontaneous abortion: a population-based study. *Obstetrics and Gynecology* 1993 July;82(10):88-91, p. 91.

Michalas S, Minaretzis D, Tsionou C, Maos G, Kioses E, Aravantinos D. Pelvic surgery, reproductive factors and risk of ectopic pregnancy: A case controlled study. *International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics* 1992 June;38(2):101-5, pp. 101, 103.

Luke B. *Every Pregnant Woman's Guide to Preventing Premature Birth*. 1995 [foreword by Emile Papiernik], New York: Times Books; p. 32.

9. Reardon, David C., Philip G. Ney, Fritz Scheuren, Jesse Cogle, Priscilla K. Coleman, and Thomas W. Strahan. *Deaths Associated With Pregnancy Outcome: A Record Linkage Study of Low Income Women*. Southern Medical Journal. Vol. 95. No. 8. Aug 2002.

This statistic is important to note because many of these deaths are due to complications from the abortion and are documented as such. Thus, the presenting cause of death will be the complication, not the abortion that caused it.

10. Gissler M, Kauppila R, Merlainen J, Toukomaa H, Hemminki E. Pregnancy-associated deaths in Finland 1987-1994; register linkage study. *British medical Journal* 1996 December 7, 313(7070):1431-4.

11. Goldner TE, Lawson HW, Xia Z, Atrash HK. Surveillance for ectopic pregnancy—United States, 1970-1989. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report, Centers for Disease Control Surveillance Summary* 1993 December; 42(SS-6):73-85.

Council on Scientific Affairs AMA. Induced termination of pregnancy before and after *Roe v Wade*. Trends in the mortality and morbidity of women. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 1992 December 9;268(22):3231-9.

12. *The Post Abortion Review*, 2, (3): 4-8, Fall 1994, published by the Elliott Institute,

PO Box 7348, Springfield, IL 62791-7348. It is important to note that many in the psychiatric community deny any serious emotional trauma after an abortion, but this has happened under similar circumstances before. It took years for the medical community to recognize Post Traumatic Stress in Vietnam veterans; ironically women who have undergone abortion often fit the profile of someone suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress according to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual IV* (standard for diagnosis of psychiatric illness in the United States).

13. *The Post Abortion Review*, 2, (3): 4-8, Fall 1994, published by the Elliott Institute, Springfield, IL. See also *Forbidden Grief: The Unspoken Pain of Abortion* by Theresa Burke, Ph.D. Acorn Books, Springfield, IL, © 2002 for more information on the emotional and physical pain women go through after an abortion.

Statistics and citations taken from a compilation of studies in: *Women's Health after Abortion: the Medical and Psychological Evidence* by Elizabeth Ring-Cassidy and Ian Gentles. Published by the Toronto based de Veber Institute for Bioethics and Social Research 2002. Page 52 makes a very important note on this highly politicized issue: "There is a marked tendency in the North-American literature on abortion for researchers to minimize their own findings. Those interested in the subject are well advised to read the numerical data and compare them carefully with the abstract or conclusions, rather than relying on either the abstract or conclusions alone. Comparisons are also recommended with literature from European countries, particularly Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries, where population size and sophisticated medical linkage data bases make data collection more accurate and comprehensive."

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VICE PRESIDENT CHENEY'S TIES TO HALLIBURTON

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a disturbing development that has just come to light. This development questions Vice President CHENEY's continuing financial ties to Halliburton, the oil services company he once headed.

This past Sunday, the Vice President made the following statement to Tim Russert on "Meet the Press." I quote from that statement. The Vice President said:

Since I left Halliburton to become George Bush's Vice President, I've severed all of my ties with the company, gotten rid of all of

my financial interest. I have no financial interest in Halliburton of any kind and haven't had, now, for over three years.

After he made that statement, my curiosity led me to take a look at the Vice President's financial disclosure records. What I saw in those reports was completely at odds with what he said on television Sunday morning. Vice President CHENEY's official financial disclosure filings with the Office of Government Ethics reveals that not only does the Vice President continue to have financial ties to Halliburton but also that Halliburton is continuing to provide personal financial benefits to the Vice President.

In the years 2001 and 2002, the Vice President received large "deferred salary" payments from Halliburton. In 2001, Halliburton paid Vice President CHENEY \$205,298 in salary, and in 2002 Halliburton paid Vice President CHENEY \$162,392 in salary. He is scheduled to receive similar payments this year, 2003, and in 2004 and 2005. That is a pretty strong "financial tie," in my view. If you ask every-day Americans if someone has a financial interest in a company that pays them annual compensation, I am certain the answer would be universally "yes."

Deferred salary is not a retirement benefit or a payment from a third-party escrow account but, rather, an ongoing corporate obligation that is paid from company funds. If a company were to go under, the beneficiary could lose the deferred salary.

In an attempt to mitigate the Vice President's continuing financial interest in Halliburton, his financial statement disclosure form says he "acquired" an insurance policy "to ensure that he will receive the equivalence of his remaining deferred compensation account with Halliburton." The terms of this insurance policy, its costs, and who paid for it are still unclear.

In addition, Vice President CHENEY continues to hold 433,333 unexercised Halliburton stock options. At the end of 2002, Vice President CHENEY's financial disclosure form stated he continued to hold these options, although the exercise prices are above the company's current stock market price. Even though these exercise prices are above current values, these options could in the future bring a substantial windfall, if Halliburton's earnings in stock value continue to grow as it benefits from large government contracts.

This morning, I looked at a chart that showed Halliburton's stock value and its growth from October of last year until the current time. It has grown by about 75 percent while the rest of the industry has remained flat over the years.

These options could bring, as I said, a substantial windfall if earnings in stock values continue to grow—I repeat—because of the value I find people have placed on Halliburton stock resulting in some pretty good contracts they have gotten in dealing with issues in Iraq.

The Vice President has signed an agreement, he said, to donate any profits from these stock options to charity, and has pledged not to take any tax deduction for the donation. Alternatively, he doesn't have to pay taxes on the value growth he would have otherwise paid. But should Halliburton stock prices increase over the next few years, the Vice President could exercise the stock options for substantial profits benefiting not only his designated charity but also providing Halliburton with a substantial tax deduction.

The issue is simple. Vice President CHENEY claims he has no financial ties to Halliburton, but his own financial disclosure report says otherwise. The American people deserve to know about this relationship with Halliburton. He may argue he has structured deals to minimize his financial windfall from his Halliburton arrangements, but he clearly still has "financial ties" to the company.

The fact that Halliburton received an enormous contract without a competitive bid or public disclosure—it was the subject of debate which we had on this floor—it was then agreed that all contracts dealing with Iraq and its reconstruction would be part of the public record.

Back in May, I wrote to the chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee requesting hearings on the no-bid contracts awarded to Halliburton in Iraq. I believe these developments now make it even more important for the Senate to hold hearings. I renew my plea to the Governmental Affairs Committee to hold hearings on the administration's initial contracts with Halliburton.

Just this week, we learned that Halliburton's no-bid contract with the Army Corps has increased from \$700 million to nearly \$1 billion. It is a lot of money.

The American people deserve answers to these serious questions concerning government ethics and accountability.

I also believe it is in the interest of the administration to cooperate so the air can be cleared and the record set straight so we know once and for all whether the Vice President admits publicly that he has a financial tie with Halliburton or continues to deny it, despite the written record filed with the Senate Ethics Committee.

FUNDING FOR WILDFIRES

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, as we are rolling along, trying to complete our work on appropriations, it won't be long that we will have the appropriations for the Interior Department on the Senate floor. I would just like to bring my colleagues up to date on some of the challenges we will be facing and how we probably have to come up with some imagination to take care of some of the problems.

We watched the weather reports from my State of Montana. Montana has had

an unusually hot, dry summer. We have also been plagued with wildfires this year. In fact, the lion's share of the fires has been in my State. I want to speak for a moment on something I think has great importance—the need to provide additional funds to the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior to pay for the cost of fighting this year's wildfires.

Nationwide, the numbers are staggering. Once again, we have suffered a terrible fire season. Little does America know, 27 firefighters lost their lives this year in the line of duty. Over 789 homes and other structures have been destroyed, and 2.8 million acres have burned. During the recent Labor Day weekend, 25,000 firefighters were working on fires in every State in the West.

As in 2000, my home State of Montana has been hit by the largest share of the damage. In fact, for much of the summer, half of the total acres burning in the whole Nation were burning in Montana. So far we have lost 600,000 acres, and the fire continues today. Weather conditions, with cooler temperatures and 2.5 inches of rain this week reported in Big Fork, MT, have helped. But there are still 20 fires that have the potential of blowing up unless the moisture continues.

During the August break, I saw the devastating impact of these fires on our parks, forests, and communities firsthand. The fires were so bad that portions of Glacier National Park and Yellowstone Park were closed to the public for many days, as were many national forest lands and, this time, wildlife refuge lands. The impact of these fires is catastrophic, not only on the land but also on the people.

During July and August, hundreds of residents were evacuated as 80 fires burned out of control throughout Montana. Roughly 125 structures were destroyed, and that included 23 homes.

Fighting these fires is expensive. The Forest Service has been spending as much as \$20 million a day on fire-fighting alone. Total expenditures this fiscal year will approach \$1 billion. That is taxpayer money. In order to pay for these extraordinary costs, the Forest Service has been forced to borrow \$595 million from other nonfire accounts. The Department of the Interior has borrowed \$100 million already and is expected to borrow at least \$50 million more before the fire season is over. Putting it in a conservative manner, the two agencies together will borrow \$850 million from other accounts to fight fires this fiscal year.

Prior to the August recess, the President and the administration submitted a supplemental request for \$289 million for fire suppression. My colleagues may recall, I was angry when the House ultimately sent us a supplemental that did not include these funds. In my view, it was highly irresponsible since the fire season was well under way and we knew those funds would be needed.

At this stage, it may be just as well that the House omitted these funds.

The pending supplemental request is now totally inadequate in light of what has transpired over the last month. If we were to approve only the pending administration request, we would leave the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior with a combined shortfall in other programs of between \$550 and \$600 million.

What would be the impact of this? In a word—substantial. The issue is not whether fires will or won't be fought when necessary. Both agencies will continue to protect life, property, and the important natural resources wherever possible. The issue is what won't get done if we fail to repay the accounts that have been raided.

Last year, we were in a similar situation. Both the Forest Service and the Interior borrowed heavily from nonfire accounts. This caused both agencies to stop work on certain things until those amounts were repaid and that account replenished. In the end, we only repaid about 60 cents on every dollar borrowed, which was the amount proposed by the administration in its supplemental request.

The impacts of this shortfall were very real, but the agencies managed to keep most programs above water by managing carryover, canceling defunct projects, and reducing the scope of projects. But as a result of last year's shortfall, this low-hanging fruit is gone.

If we do not act soon to repay in full—and that is my intent, to repay in full the amounts borrowed during the fiscal year 2003—the impacts will be far greater. A wide variety of programs will be deeply affected—from endangered species monitoring to facilities construction, from land acquisition to recreation management, from the processing of grazing permits to the sale of timber. Failing to repay the amounts borrowed will affect all of these things. It amounts to a de facto rescission of funds appropriated by Congress just 6 months ago.

To my colleagues from over the Nation, I would say this is not just a western problem simply because that is where most of the fires burn. It is a problem for every State in the Union because the funds are effectively being borrowed from every State. They are being borrowed in many cases from projects and programs that were funded at the specific request of every Member in this body. If the amounts are not repaid, those amounts will permanently be taken from many of those same projects and programs again. Maybe it will come from a National Park Service construction project. Maybe it will be in Massachusetts. Maybe it will come from land acquisition in Arizona. Maybe it will come out of grazing management in Colorado. More than likely, it will come from all that I have mentioned.

The use of borrowing authority to fight fires is not necessarily a bad thing. It is a reasonable mechanism when the amounts being borrowed are